

**City of Salem Planning Board  
Approved Meeting Minutes  
Thursday, Jan. 19, 2017**

A public hearing of the Salem Planning Board was held on Thursday, January 19, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. at City Hall Annex, 120 Washington Street, Room 313, Salem, Massachusetts.

Chair Ben Anderson opens the meeting at 7:00 pm.

**I. ROLL CALL**

*Those present were:* Chair Ben Anderson, Bill Grisct, Helen Sides, Dale Yale, Carole Hamilton, Kirt Rieder, Matt Ven0 and Noah Koretz (9)

*Absent:* Tony Mataragas

*Also in attendance:* Amanda Chiancola, Staff Planner, and Stacy Kilb, recorder

**II. OLD/NEW BUSINESS**

**A. Guest Speaker Andrea Leary, Executive Director of the North Shore Transportation Management Association (NSTMA), will provide the Planning Board information about the NSTMA**

Ms. Leary presents a PowerPoint on the TMA.

- What is a TMA?
- What does a TMA do?
- How does a TMA achieve its objectives?
- How can the NSTMA benefit Salem?
- Municipal and State Regulations that support TMA growth
- What else the NSTMA works to do

This item will be on a future agenda for additional Board discussion regarding participation and implementation during site plan review. Discussion on dues and logistics occurs.

**B. Designation of a Board Member to serve on the Community Preservation Committee**

Matt Ven0 describes his role on this Committee; he has not been able to attend meetings regularly and feels that another Board member who can commit to attending meetings should be selected. Carole Hamilton volunteers to serve for the next year.

*All vote in favor of a motion to appoint Carole Hamilton as the Planning Board representative to the CPC.*

**C. Discussion on Design Review within the Entrance Corridor Overlay District**

This would require a zoning amendment in a joint hearing with City Council. Amanda Chiancola requests that the Planning Board discuss their recommended expanded role of the Design Review Board (DRB), i.e. the trigger for review and the guidelines that would be used.

Ms. Chiancola asks the Planning Board provided a draft memo to Board Members for their review.

Options for triggering DRB review are discussed, including a size threshold for projects within the Entrance Corridor Overlay District (ECOD).

Matt Veno suggests there might be an existing document that outlines some relevant guidelines for design within the ECOD, but it is uncertain. If that document exists, then he recommends it be used. Chair Anderson cites the very generic relevant section of the ordinance. The possibility of open interpretation of that could be detrimental to project development.

Additional discussion ensues about the expansion of the DRB's role in guiding projects proposed in the ECOD. Helen Sides comments that the DRB has never received any complaints that their procedures are onerous; on the contrary every developer that has come before them has been grateful to have their input. Noah Koretz feels that attorneys will not be in favor of the change as it is more legal work for them, but agrees that clients find it helpful. Kirt Rieder suggests recasting these changes as a positive tool for clients and striking the work "burden" as it is only has potential to benefit projects.

The SPR requirements in the ECOD are clarified: in the ECOD is 2,000 square feet, or 6 or more residential units. SPR is the suggested trigger for design review.

The guidelines are discussed. Amanda recommends guidelines for design review so that project applicants know what to expect going into the DRB, and so that the DRB is able to provide guidance consistent with the community's vision. Design review already does, and will continue, to be done on a case by case basis. Noah Koretz notes that while the City has a great DRB now, he is concerned about the future makeup of the DRB, as their recommendations will only be as good as the people on the board. Helen Sides feels that, while it may depend on the administration, there is plenty of talent, interest and passion available to make sure it is adequately and professionally staffed. Many board members feel that guidelines are not necessary.

Chair Anderson is comfortable with using Site Plan Review as a threshold, but feels that design guidelines are needed.

The Board agrees with SPR as the threshold and will seek DRB input on how to apply guidelines.

#### **D. Provide the Registry of Deeds an update on the Planning Board Members**

Amanda Chiancola explains that the Planning Board must provide the Registry of Deeds an updated list of Planning Board Members, as further described in a letter from the Registry. Ms. Chiancola distributed the sheet for the Board Members to sign, which will subsequently be recorded by the Registry.

### **III. REGULAR AGENDA**

- A. Location:** 60 & 64 Grove Street and 1, 3, and 5 Harmony Grove Road (Map 16, Lots 237, 236, 377, 239 and 378)
- Applicant:** MRM PROJECT MANAGEMENT, LLC FOR THE PROJECT KNOWN AS GROVE STREET APARTMENTS (F/K/A LEGACY PARK AT HARMONY GROVE APARTMENTS)
- Description:** The applicant requested a continuance to the regularly scheduled meeting on **THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2017** of a public hearing for application to amend the previously approved Site Plan Review, Planned Unit Development Special Permit and Flood Hazard District Special Permit Decision dated December 11, 2014. Specifically, the application proposes to modify the condition requiring restoration of the office building located at 60 Grove Street due to its unsafe condition and to instead demolish the building and temporarily create a landscaped open space until specific commercial development plans are developed. No changes are proposed to the total square footage or footprints of the buildings or number of dwelling units in the project. The 60 Grove Street property is to remain commercial in nature.

A motion to continue to the February 16, 2017 meeting is made by Matt Veno, seconded by Kirt Rieder, and passes 7-0 with Noah Koretz abstaining.

## **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

### **A. January 5, 2017**

A motion to approve the Jan. 5, 2017 minutes, with minor amendments, is made by Carole Hamilton, seconded by Helen Sides, and carries 7-0 with Matt Veno abstaining.

## **IV. ADJOURNMENT**

A motion to adjourn is made by Kirt Rieder, seconded by Helen Sides, and carries 8-0.

The meeting ends at 8:21 PM.

For actions where the decisions have not been fully written into these minutes, copies of the decisions have been posted separately by address or project at: <http://www.salem.com/planning-board/webforms/planning-board-2017-decisions>

Respectfully submitted,  
Stacy Kilb, Recording Clerk

Approved by the Planning Board on 04/20/2017

*Know your rights under the Open Meeting Law M.G.L. c. 30A § 18-25 and City Ordinance § 2-2028 through § 2-2033.*